

# NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

## INTERVENTIONAL PROCEDURES PROGRAMME

### Equality impact assessment

#### IPG749 Laparoscopic insertion of a magnetic ring for gastro-oesophageal reflux disease

The impact on equality has been assessed during guidance development according to the principles of the NICE Equality scheme.

#### Briefing

1. Have any potential equality issues been identified during the briefing process (development of the brief or discussion at the committee meeting), and, if so, what are they?

Age: The risk of developing gastro-oesophageal reflux disease (GORD) increases with age. However, in a UK GP database study, the incidence of GORD increased with age in both men and women until the age of 69 years, from which point the trend was reversed.

Gender: The condition affects both sexes equally and there is no significant association between gender and GORD.

Socioeconomic status: In a UK postal survey of 4,432 adults, gastro-oesophageal reflux symptoms were more common among the socially disadvantaged.

Disability: People with GORD are likely to be covered by the Equality Act if their condition has had a substantial adverse impact on normal day to day activities for over 12 months or is likely to do so.

2. What is the preliminary view as to what extent these potential equality issues need addressing by the committee? (If there are exclusions listed in the brief (for example, populations, treatments or settings), are these justified?)

This was not thought to have an impact on the assessment of the procedure. No exclusions were applied.

3. Has any change to the brief (such as additional issues raised during the committee meeting) been agreed to highlight potential equality issues?

No

4. Have any additional stakeholders related to potential equality issues been identified during the committee meeting, and, if so, have changes to the stakeholder list been made?

No

**Kevin Harris**

**Approved by Consultant Clinical Advisor**

**Date:** 06/09/2022

## **Consultation**

1. Have the potential equality issues identified during the briefing process been addressed by the committee, and, if so, how?

The key evidence showed that when reported, the mean age of patients ranged from 39 to 62 years and they were more likely to be male.

No specific data relating to other issue mentioned earlier was identified in the literature presented in the overview.

2. Have any other potential equality issues been raised in the overview, specialist adviser questionnaires or patient commentary, and, if so, how has the committee addressed these?
No

3. Have any other potential equality issues been identified by the committee, and, if so, how has the committee addressed these?
No

4. Do the preliminary recommendations make it more difficult in practice for a specific group to access a technology or intervention compared with other groups? If so, what are the barriers to, or difficulties with, access for the specific group?
No

5. Is there potential for the preliminary recommendations to have an adverse impact on people with disabilities because of something that is a consequence of the disability?
Not applicable

6. Are there any recommendations or explanations that the committee could make to remove or alleviate barriers to, or difficulties with, access identified in questions 4 or 5, or otherwise fulfil NICE's obligation to promote equality?
Not applicable

7. Have the committee's considerations of equality issues been described in the consultation document, and, if so, where?
No

**Kevin Harris**

**Approved by Consultant Clinical Advisor**

**Date:** 06/09/2022

**Final interventional procedures document**

1. Have any additional potential equality issues been raised during the consultation, and, if so, how has the committee addressed these?
No

2. If the recommendations have changed after consultation, are there any recommendations that make it more difficult in practice for a specific group to access a technology or intervention compared with other groups? If so, what are the barriers to, or difficulties with, access for the specific group?
Not applicable

3. If the recommendations have changed after consultation, is there potential for the preliminary recommendations to have an adverse impact on people with disabilities because of something that is a consequence of the disability?
Not applicable

4. If the recommendations have changed after consultation, are there any recommendations or explanations that the committee could make to remove or alleviate barriers to, or difficulties with, access identified in questions 2 and 3, or otherwise fulfil NICE's obligations to promote equality?
Not applicable

5. Have the committee's considerations of equality issues been described in the final interventional procedures document, and, if so, where?
No

**Anastasia Chalkidou**

**Associate Director**

**Date:** 02/11/2022